



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

moral fitness of pictorial delineations of our Lord's person, or against their religious expediency in any absolute and universal way. There is nothing in the New Testament which directly or indirectly forbids it, and I find no proof that the first Christians were instructed by the apostles, in any teachings not preserved in the authoritative documents of Christianity, to regard it as wrong in itself, or injurious in its tendency and effects: so that, admitting all that is said of the repugnance of the early Christians to such delineations, it is still open to inquiry what were their reasons for this repugnance, and whether they are sound and valid for us, and for all times.

The founders of Christianity were Jews, brought up under the powerful influence of the old Hebrew religious culture. The Old Testament is full of strict and awful prohibitions not only of idolatry, but of any attempt to give sensible form to the idea of JEHOVAH, the purely SPIRITUAL God, the DEITY UNMANIFESTED in any determinate form. From reverence the Hebrews abstained even from pronouncing the very NAME, giving always to the letters when they met them in their Holy Books another sound, the utterance of a less awful word.

Now, though Christianity, in contradistinction to the old Hebrew religion, is precisely the religion of "God manifest in the flesh," a revelation of the Invisible in a visible, determinate, historical form, yet as the first Christians were taught to regard our Lord as at once God and Man, it would not be at all strange if they shrunk from any artistic representation of the Manifested Divinity, in the same way as they did from giving sensible form to Jehovah, the Undisclosed, whom it was impious to image, forbidden to figure under any likeness. This would be very natural, and some such feeling may likely enough have been very prevalent. But it concludes nothing as to the question before us. The prohibition to figure Jehovah, the Absolute, undisclosed in any sensible form, cannot in its own force be necessarily extended to the portraiture of the Son of God, sent in a visible human form. And I am unable to conceive any reason based upon the Second Commandment, or drawn from any other source, which ought to have deterred a competent portrait-painter (supposing such an one to have been among those about our Lord), from taking an exact likeness of Him, as He appeared during his historical presence on the earth. What, if such a portrait had come down authenticated along the ages to our times! Should we in any way feel bound or disposed to turn from it, as something impious to have been taken, wrong to copy, wrong to gaze upon?

But the early Christians were mainly, I think, deterred from making pictorial representations of our Lord's person, by considerations of religious prudence, which are now of no force. They were surrounded by idolaters, by temples filled with images of the gods of the heathens. Statues and pictures of Christ might come to be classed in the same category with the images of the false gods, and so the pre-eminence dignity and exclusive pretensions of the Christian religion might suffer disparagement and even run the risk of being taken as a mere idolatrous superstition.

Supposing such to have been the feeling of the early Christians, it obviously has no bearing upon the question, whether the person of our Lord is a proper subject for artistic representation now-a-days.

But, passing from this, I will conclude with one or two remarks of a more general nature. It seems to me it is scarcely worth while to say anything in regard to any supposed tendency to superstitious abuse of pictorial representations of our Lord. I am unable to conceive in what way anything harmful can come from the contemplation of such works, supposing them, of course, to be true works of art, conceived and executed in the spirit of religious reverence; unless it be in a way in which every religious idea, and every form of expressing it, is liable to superstitious abuse—which would be an objection practically amounting to nothing.

But the point of irreverence is more worthy to be considered. Everything relating to our Lord should be matter of profoundest reverence. Nothing at variance with it can be defended. Is it then irreverent in itself to attempt pictorial representations of Christ? or does the contemplation of them tend to produce an irreverent spirit? I cannot admit it. Our Lord, though the Son of God, was also as truly a man as any of us. He had a determinate human form and lineaments. He led a historical life on earth—speaking, acting as a man, though in a Divine-human way. Minute details of that life in many of its parts and actions have, by Divine ordering, come down to us. These, it is our duty to study and to realize as historical facts with all the vividness we are capable of. To do this implies and requires, and therefore justifies, the exertion of the imaginative faculty in every one in the measure of its gift. And if, in attempting to realize in a true, living way the historical life of Christ on the earth, we cannot help framing to ourselves, in our thoughts, in our fancy and our imagination, quite determinate representations of Him and of His wonderful acts of Divine Power and Love; if this be not only lawful and right, but good and salutary—as must, I think, be allowed by every one, how can we think it irreverent for the artist to embody in sensible form, in marble, or on canvas, those representations which, as a devout believer, earnestly pondering the story of the Saviour's Life and Death, his imagination cannot but frame? What is there in the spirit of the profoundest reverence which should deter him from sketching in lines and colors the pictures which cannot but paint themselves before his "mind's eye," any more than the poet from giving form "in winged words" to the images that crowd before his "vision and faculty divine"? And how should a reverent spirit prompt us to turn away from the one more than from the other? A just taste may be offended, our very reverence may be shocked, by a work false to the true principles of art, or by an unworthy conception embodied in the work of an artist not wanting in genius; a just taste, I think, is offended by such works as Ruben's "Taking Down from the Cross"—so merely human, so merely physical human, is the paramount and almost sole expression of the piece: but this is, of course, no proof that the delineation of our Lord's person is itself

incompatible with the spirit of proper reverence.

Such, in substance, I believe, are the thoughts I expressed to our friend in afterwards conversing with him on the subject of his letter. Whether or not my utterances, or the better working of his own thoughts, are to have the credit of leading him to any change in his views, I cannot say. But I am sure all who have been in his studio, and seen his picture of Christ going to Emmaus, will be glad to think that the scruples expressed in his letter passed for a time, at least, from his mind; and to hope that work may not be the only production of the kind coming from his pencil. And all who know what a pure and lofty Christian spirit animates his genius, will, I think, be agreed in the opinion that there is no painter in our land or times better fitted to contribute to the glory of Christian Art.

GENEVA, July 25th, 1856.

### ART AMONG THE HEBREWS.

THE TEMPLE OF SOLOMON.

(Translated for THE CRAYON, from the French of F. E. De Mercey.)

Of the many races that have appeared on this planet, the Jewish is that concerning which we possess written documents, the most exact and the most complete. Its history, its religion, its manners, its literature, are familiar to us; and while we possess neither a single Egyptian book, nor a single Assyrian treatise, the writings of its prophets, of its legislators, and of its kings, have all reached us entire.

Yet, by an inexplicable singularity, this people who have transmitted to us, such numerous and such certain written proofs of its existence, has left us no fragment of its statuary, of its painting; no inscription, no graven stone, no standing monument, which might materially testify, in a striking manner, to its sojourn on our globe. While the works of art of the Egyptians, of the Assyrians, of the Babylonians, or of the Greeks, abound among our collections, and give evidence, as it were, to an enviable extent, of the importance and grandeur of these nations, no museum can offer us a work of Jewish antiquity of incontestable authenticity.

The fine fragments of a royal sarcophagus, brought by our learned friend M. de Saulcy, from Jerusalem, and deposited in the Louvre, would appear, we know, to contradict the assertion. But, interesting as this monument may be, it presents only a secondary interest. It belongs rather to ornamental art, than to art properly so called. The style of its ornamentation is rather Phœnician than Jewish, as M. de Saulcy has himself proved by comparing a sarcophagus of stone to a sarcophagus of lead coming from Ronad (Aradnus) and bought at the bazar of Beyroun. Must we then absolutely confound the two arts?

The monuments that M. de Saulcy studied on the spot, during his voyage in the biblical countries, and of which he has given us such precise and interesting descriptions, might have modified certain ideas too absolute upon this complete obliteration of the vestiges left to us by the Hebrew people. For example, we no longer doubt, that the

rather extended parts of the walls of the platform which supported the Temple of Jerusalem, reach to the time of Solomon, and the Jewish burial grounds in the valleys of Jehosaphat and of Himnon, appear to us to offer some small monuments of the same date. A very curious bas-relief, in Assyrian style, and some fragments of architecture gathered in the land of the Moabites appear to us also of more ancient date, or rather contemporaneous with the more ancient periods of Hebrew art. The bas-relief found at Tabariah representing a seven-branched chandelier, is also a Hebrew work; but this includes nearly all the specimens of certain origin which can be offered as models.

We judge of monuments a little as we do of individuals, by physiognomy, and it appears to us that the physiognomy of a certain number of these monuments which M. de Sauley attributes to the ancient Hebrews, is much more Greek than Jewish. Such are, for example, the sepulchres of the kings, of the judges, and of Saint James, and those of the tombs of Absalom and of Zachariah. It is only with difficulty that we can allow ourselves to recognize a Jewish work, in the ornamentation of the entablature of the exterior wall belonging to the vestibule of the sepulchre of the kings. Those palms, those patera, those triglyphs, with their drops, and especially the cornice which surmounts the whole, appear to us to be entirely Greek. The cluster of grapes placed between the crowns and the garlands of foliage and of fruits which run along the exterior edge of the door, would alone lead us to some doubts; they are treated with the delicacy which the Hebrews observed in that kind of work, in which they excelled, the representation of men and animals being prohibited to them. Might not the two arts, Greek and Hebrew have concurred to the decoration of this entablature? Might not the architect employed by King Herod to restore it, when he caused an expiatory monument to be built at the door of the tomb which he had profaned, be the author of this composite work? We know of more than one analogous restoration of our old monuments, in which we meet the most singular amalgamation of contemporary and gothic style. What kind of tablet will these particularly important restorations, executed apart from the action of the commission on historical monuments, give to future archæologists?

Be it as it may, this tomb is for us the tomb of kings. M. de Sauley has proved it in several ways, to a degree of certainty equal to mathematical demonstration. On the other hand, we do not doubt, but that the Assyrians were acquainted with the patera as well as the Greeks; and that they transmitted them to the Phœnicians. We acknowledge that the Egyptians have in their most ancient monuments made frequent use of the triglyphs and the mouldings adopted by the Greeks; and lastly, we agree, that the Hebrews made use of palms in the ornamentation of their edifices. The isolated use of each of these ornaments, seems to us, then, very natural, while their incidental union, in order to form an architectural ensemble altogether Greek, raises doubts that we cannot dissipate.

As regards the ornamentation of the

pediment of the tomb of St. James, our opinion is nearly the same. The tombs of Absalom and of Zachariah appear to us to be Greek monuments of later times. The Ionic capital, has it really been transmitted from the Phœnicians to the Hebrews, and to the Greeks by the latter? We would rather be inclined to believe in the direct transmission from the Phœnicians to the Greeks. For the same reason, we do not believe in those pure and simple styles, which the Greeks might have borrowed from the Hebrews of an art nearly complete, that is to say, which produces monuments as perfect as the entablature of the sepulchre of the kings and the pediment of the tomb of the judges.

The Greeks, in order to render their architecture so perfect have, it is true, taken a little from each; first from the Egyptians, afterwards from the Phœnicians, then from the Assyrians, and from the Hebrews. By means of these various elements, their exquisite taste has combined the wonderful amalgamation which constitutes their art. If they have borrowed, they have returned a hundredfold to those who lent them; and, in our opinion, these monuments of Jewish art much resemble some restitution of this kind.

The discoveries which are daily being made in Assyria, will perhaps, supply the absence of Hebrew monuments. Already Messrs. Longperrier, Rawlinson, and Layard have recognized among the bas-reliefs of Khorsabad various subjects which relate to the victory of the Assyrians over the Jews. One of these bas-reliefs reproduces even the site and the fortifications of Jerusalem. It is beyond doubt, that the exhumation of these places hidden under every hillock of Mesopotamia, and the numerous works of sculpture, which decorate them, cannot fail to throw light on the architecture, the arts, and the civilization of the Jewish nation.

Judea does not border on Assyria, and is even somewhat distant from it, yet between these two countries there existed numerous relations. The patriarchs had inhabited the country of Babylon, before coming to the land of Canaan. Arphaxad the son of Shem, who peopled Chaldea, was the grandfather of Heber, who gave his name to the Hebrews. Hebrews and Chaldeans, therefore, sprung from a common source. Originally their religion, their manners, their languages, were the same. It suffices to cast a glance upon the Assyrian works of sculpture, to study the physiognomy, so marked, of the personages who are figured there, and to compare them with the Jewish types which we have before our eyes, in order to recognize that these two nations belong to the same race, and form a part of the same family.

The discoveries made in Assyria have also rendered much clearer and more intelligent, the description given to us by the sacred writings concerning the temple and the palace of Solomon. The Phœnicians, and consequently the Hebrews, have borrowed much more from the Assyrian, than from the Egyptian art, and this must have resulted from the community of origin which we have just pointed out.

These borrowed styles are anterior to the transportation of the Jews to Babylon, and in the description of the temple and of the palace of Solomon, we will presently have

to note many points of similarity, or, to speak more definitely, a great number of Assyrianisms.

It has been a matter of astonishment up to this day, that no Assyrian temple should have been found in the hillocks excavated by the English or French mission. But have these temples ever existed? The Hebrews, zealous for the dogma of religious unity, had but one God, one temple, one altar, and one high priest. It is probable that the nations of Chaldean origin, under the dominion of analogous religious sentiments, had for a long time, like them, but a single temple, either at Nineveh, at Neby-Younes, or at Babylon, on the last step of the pyramid of Babel.

The epoch of the construction of the temple and of the palace of Solomon is posterior by three centuries, to that of the Medo-Assyrian palace of Nimrod, and anterior by more than two centuries to that of the palace of Khorsabad; it preceded nearly five centuries the erection of the edifices of Persepolis of which it seemed to be the prototype.

The temple of Solomon comprises the whole architecture, and the whole art belonging to the Hebrews. The history of the construction of these edifices, such as it is given to us in the sacred writings, conveys to us most precisely and completely the manner in which these people, of ancient civilization proceeded in the execution of those monuments which have been ranked among the wonders of the world. In this case, there is no void, nothing to induce conjecture; we can follow the construction of the edifice from the laying of the first stone of its sub-basement until that final moment, when the last workman fastens, with golden nails, the golden leaves which adorn its gates.

David, after having taken the city of Salem and chased away from it the Jebusites, its first masters, gave to his conquest the name of Jerusalem or Sacred City. He caused a palace to be built upon Mount Sion, and prepared to raise a temple to the Lord that might be worthy of him, and which took the place of the temporary tabernacle, under which the ark of the covenant had till then been sheltered. This ark, which contained the tables of Moses, was made of Shittim wood; it was 2½ cubits\* long and 2½ cubits wide, by the same in height; but its interior and exterior were covered with gold, and its roof was ornamented with kneeling cherubim, facing each other, and covering the ark with their wings. These figures were of gold, beaten with the hammer.

At the moment when David was going to commence the temple, he was stopped by the prophet Nathan, who announced to him in the name of the Lord, that he should leave to his son the honor of building his house. It was to obey this order, that Solomon, scarcely enthroned, turned his attention to the construction of the temple.

Mount Moriah appeared to him to be a more eligible site for this edifice than either of the Mountains of Sion, or of Bezetha. Its position was more prominent and more central, and its surface more extended. It was, however, far from being sufficient for the vast structures for which

\* A cubit is 1 foot 9¾ inches.

it was destined. By means of herculean labor, it was transformed by Solomon into an extended platform, which overlooked the city on three sides, and the southern part of which, being 300 cubits high, rose perpendicularly out of the Valley of Jehosaphat, at the bottom of which runs the stream of Kedron. At present, this vast platform, which embraces an area not less than 1,635 yards in extent, is still partly to be seen. Listen to the learned traveller who last visited it, and who has best described it.

"On reaching this imposing wall, I was struck with admiration. At a height of more than 12 metres, (13 yards) the primitive structure remains intact; regular layers of fine blocks of stone, perfectly squared, but in rustic style, that is to say, presenting a smooth band next the joints, are superposed up to 2 or 3 metres (yards) from the summit of the wall. It needs but a single glance to recognize that the Jewish tradition has remained undoubtedly true. No similar wall has been constructed, either by the Greeks or the Romans. It is evidently a sample of Jewish architecture. In the under layers, the stones are almost invariably of one width, double that of their height. At times, however, square blocks are found in juxtaposition with each other, between the blocks of greater width. The four last layers are formed of square blocks, except the last but one, which is composed of blocks three times greater in length than in height. In proportion as these layers rise above the soil, the dimensions of the blocks diminish. In short, each layer is set back 5 centimetres from the preceding one, and these successive shortenings constitute, as we see, considerable advantage for the Solomonian wall. Some blocks of the wall project considerably in rustic style of work. I measured two of these blocks, which were not less than 5 metres, 28 centimetres and 7m. 25c. (16 feet and 28 feet) long by 1 metre (3 feet) in height. We can judge by this, the great extent of Solomon's architectural machinery. The angle of the wall is formed of layers of the same description, and equally receding on each other, five hundredths of a metre ( $\frac{1}{2}$  inches). Here, again, the stones are in rustic style, that is to say, each one enframed by a beaded cordon about  $\frac{3}{4}$  inches in width. Some of these stones are of incredible dimensions; thus, one of them is 9m. 35c. (28 feet) by more than 1 metre (3 feet) in height. Who knows to what extent it may penetrate into the masonry?"\*

The foundation of the Temple of Solomon, has, as we see, an extreme analogy with the platforms of Persepolis, of Istakr, and of Passargade. The construction of this latter platform, is in some measure, identical with the construction of the sub-structure of the Temple of Jerusalem. In fact, it is composed of enormous blocks of stone regularly arranged, cut in rustic, the upper layers setting back from the lower layers.†

These constructions gave occupation to whole armies of laborers. The Bible in-

forms us that eighty thousand men proceeded to the mountain to quarry out the stone and to cut it, and that seventy thousand men were engaged in the transportation. The persons who had the management or the direction of each special work, and whom we would call superintendents, were three thousand six hundred in number. These numbers seem to us to partake a little of oriental extravagance, especially if we compare them to the three thousand workmen and their twelve or fifteen overseers, sufficient at the present moment, for the work of completing the Louvre, which is six times the magnitude of the Temple of Solomon.

Besides these legions of cutters of stone and workmen, a third army composed of woodcutters and of carpenters, were engaged, (by the authority of Hiram, king of Tyre, with whom Solomon had made a treaty) to cut from Lebanon, under the direction of the Sidonians, who were the best cutters of wood, the cedar and pine, necessary for the construction of the temple.

These workmen numbered thirty thousand, and went by turns to Lebanon, ten thousand each month. Adoniram had the superintendence of them all.\*

In exchange for the cedars of his forests, and his kind offices, Solomon pledged himself to furnish to Hiram every month, for the support of his household, twenty thousand measures of wheat, and twenty thousand measures of pure oil. Twenty thousand sacks of meal; the same of barley; twenty thousand barrels of wine, and twenty thousand casks of oil, were appropriated to the support of the workmen.

Besides the wood and the men to cut it, Solomon had asked Hiram for a skilful man, who understood working in gold, silver, copper, and iron; who knew how to work in purple, scarlet, and hyacinth colors, and in all sorts of carving.

Hiram sent him a celebrated workman from Tyre, who bore the same name as himself, whose father was Tyrene, and his mother a widow of the tribe of Naphtali. Hiram worked in bronze. He knew how to engrave all sorts of figures and to invent

\* Upon the subject of the felling of the cedars on Mount Lebanon, under the authority of Hiram, profane historians agree with the sacred writings.

Menander, who has translated into Greek, the annals of Phœnicia, says of this prince, that he caused a great deal of wood to be cut on Mount Lebanon, to be made use of for the covering of temples. Besides, it would appear, that King Hiram must have been essentially a Polytheist, for, while he made Solomon that magnificent present of cedar wood, to be appropriated to the Temple of the God of the Hebrews, Menander informs us that he consecrated a pillar of gold in the temple of Jupiter, and that he built temples to Hercules and to Venus Astarte.

Dion expresses himself in regard to Hiram, in about the same terms: "After the death of Abibal," says he, "Hiram, his son and his successor, fortified the city of Tyre on the east, and, in order to join it to the temple of Jupiter Olympius, caused the space which separated them to be filled with earth. He gave a very large sum of gold to this temple, and also caused a great quantity of wood to be cut on Mount Lebanon to be appropriated to similar purposes." *Josephus, Ant. Book VIII. ch. 11. Extracts from Meander Dion.*

ingeniously everything necessary for all kinds of work. Hiram was at the same time the architect and the decorator of the temple.

The first stone of the edifice was laid 480 years after the departure of the children of Israel from Egypt, and the fourth year of the reign of Solomon, in the month of Zio, the second of the year.\*

The stones from the mountain reached Jerusalem all cut and polished, and there was nothing to be done but to place them, so that in the construction of the edifice, there was heard neither hammer nor axe, nor the sound of any kind of tool.

The cedars and the pines cut on Lebanon, and brought down to the nearest point of the Phœnician shore, were arranged in rafts, and brought by sea to Joppa, from which place Solomon had them transferred to Jerusalem.

The form of the temple, modelled on that of the tabernacle was very simple. It was a rectangle of 100 cubits in length, by 20 cubits in width. This rectangle was divided into three parts, lengthwise. The first division, forming the vestibule, was 20 cubits long by 20 cubits wide; its height was 120 cubits.† The second division, the temple properly so called, or the sanctum, was 60 cubits long by 20 wide, and 30 in height. The third division of the temple, called the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, situated at the remotest part of the edifice, was 20 cubits high, by the same in width and in depth. Upon the exterior of the temple, upon its walls, or rather against its walls, were three series of chambers, ranging in stories, one above the other, sustained by beams, which were not attached to the walls of the temple, and consequently standing upright a few cubits from the edifice. The lowest floor was 5 cubits wide; the middle one was 6 cubits, and the upper one was 7 cubits. It was, then, necessary that the exterior wall of the temple should recede nearly 3 cubits from the base to the summit, or that these chambers should be constructed in corbeling. A low wall went all round the temple, undoubtedly under these three series of chambers, which were reached by a spiral staircase, invented by Solomon himself.

This interior disposition of the temple, this triple division, and even those chambers placed all around, which served as an habitation for the priests and as a receptacle for the archives, the treasure and the sacred objects, are also to be found in the Temple of Persepolis, called the Palace of Darius, which would appear to have been constructed upon the plan of the Temple of Solomon, but upon a more reduced scale.

\* It was about the year of the world 3000, the four hundred and eighteenth after the departure from Egypt, and to reconcile sacred and profane history, one hundred and eighty years after the taking of Troy, two hundred and fifty before the foundation of Rome, and one thousand years before Christ, that Solomon finished this wonderful edifice. *Bossuet, Discours sur l'histoire universelle, 6e époque.*

† The exterior of this vestibule, 120 cubits high, that is to say, 90 cubits higher than the temple itself, recalls the pylons of the Egyptian temples and the towers placed upon the porch of our cathedrals.

\* De Sauley. *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte*, Vol. I. p. 190.

† This same arrangement is found in the sub-basement of the lantern of Demosthenes, at Athens and in the enclosure of Assos.

The Temple of Solomon was surrounded by several courts or enclosures. The nearest enclosure to the sanctuary was called *the court of priests*. It was encircled by a wall 3 cubits high, surmounted by a railing of cedar wood. It was within this enclosure that were placed the sea of brass, the ten lavers of bronze, and in the porch of the vestibule of the temple, the two pillars Jachin and Boaz. It was entered through four porticoes which gave on the east, the west, the north, and the south, and to which were attached large gates entirely gilded.

The second enclosure, or court of the Israelites, was square and surrounded by a porch formed by a double colonnade of stone, something in the style of the porch of St. Peters at Rome. This court enclosed, behind the colonnade, the apartments for the Levites, the musicians, and the guardian priests of the sanctuary. A last court, called the court of the Gentiles, formed a third enclosure. It was one stadium in extent upon each side, or 500 cubits. Only three gates opened into the third court, which was surrounded by high walls. The rooms of the keepers, of the servants, of the cooks, of the purveyors, and of the merchants, were placed all around the court. It was undoubtedly from here that these latter slipped into the temple, from which Jesus drove them away.

The interior decoration of the temple was of great magnificence. The walls were panelled their whole length with planks of cedar, and boarded with pine wood so that not a single stone could be seen. Solomon ordered the panels of the vestibule to be gilded with very pure gold; but upon the panels of the *Sanctum*, he ordered plates of gold, upon which were carved palm trees, small chains, intertwined with each other, and cherubim. These cherubim, are for us, analogous to the winged figures of the bas-reliefs and the paintings of the Assyrians.

The *Sanctum Sanctorum* was also covered with plates of gold which might be valued at 600 talents. These plates were fastened with golden nails, each one weighing 50 shekels. The chambers of the upper stories were also covered with gold. The altar was inlaid with gold. There was nothing in the temple which was not covered with gold.

Solomon caused two cherubim 10 cubits high to be sculptured and placed in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*.\* These statues were of olive wood, covered with leaves of beaten gold. Their wings were spread and covered a space of twenty cubits. One of the wings of each of them touched the wall of the temple; the two other wings joined in the middle of the sanctuary. These cherubim were represented erect on their feet, and their faces turned towards the exterior temple. The ark of the covenant, which contained the tables of the laws transmitted to Moses on Mount Sinai, was placed in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, under the wings of the cherubim.

A curtain of hyacinth, purple and scar-

\* The historian Josephus gives but 5 cubits as the height of these cherubim, which, according to his account, must have been of massive gold; but he adds that it would be impossible to imagine their form.

let, woven in fine linen, upon which were represented cherubim, separated the sanctuary from the interior temple. Besides this curtain, two doors of olive wood, covered with gold, and upon which were again sculptured in relief, cherubim and palm trees, formed a second division.

At the entrance of the temple were placed two gates of pine wood. Each gate had a twofold division, and its two parts united when it was opened. They were covered with plates of gold, where also were to be seen cherubim, palm trees, and other ornaments cut out with considerable projection.

Solomon ornamented the walls of the temple all around, with mouldings and works of sculpture, representing cherubim and palms in relief, and with various paintings which seemed to disengage themselves from their background, and stand out upon the wall. Ezekiel informs us that these palms and cherubim alternated.\* It was, as we see, a decoration altogether according to the Assyrian style.

The temple was paved with precious stones of great beauty; but at intervals, the ground was covered with a floor of cypress wood, enriched by plates of gold. The exterior porches and courts were paved with mosaics, resembling, undoubtedly, the pavement ornamented with roses, which has just been discovered in the Palace of Sardanapalus at Koyoundjeh. M. De Sauley thinks that he found upon the table-land of Mount Moriah, the cubes of black, white and red mosaic, which were combined in the composition of this pavement.

The interior decoration and the furnishing of the temple had been entrusted to Hiram, who was as skillful as a founder and decorator, as he was learned as an architect. The foundry was situated upon a plain of the Jordan, between Socoth and Saradatha. The clayish nature of the soil had no doubt decided the choice of this location, all the objects which decorated the temple having been designed for casting in the clay.

Hiram first cast the two famous pillars of Jachin and Boaz, which were placed in the vestibule of the temple,—Jachin on the right, and Boaz on the left. The Bible varies concerning the height of these pillars. According to Kings they were 16 cubits high, and according to the Chronicles 35 cubits. Their capitals were 5 cubits high. These pillars and these capitals were ornamented with lilies, meshes, network, and chains, interlaced with admirable skill. Two hundred pomegranates, arranged in two rows, were mingled with chains and rings of gold. This decoration of the vestibule, again recalls the four pillars of the porch of the temple or palace of Darius, at Persepolis; and the great

\* Ezekiel, in one of his visions, gives us, no doubt, according to his recollection, a description of the decoration of the temple, which seems to us to be essentially Assyrian. See Ezekiel, ch. XL. vs. 18-20. Ezekiel wrote in the twenty-fifth year of the captivity of Babylon, fourteen years after the ruin of Jerusalem. These cherubim or winged figures, alternating with the palm, especially recall the circular frieze of enamelled bricks, which decorates one of the ornamented gates of Khorsabad; only that in this frieze rosettes are substituted for the palm.

Persepolitan pillars, with long capitals, many of which yet remain standing, can alone aid us in comprehending the 5 cubit capitals of Jachin and Boaz, with which, except the material and the running intertwining ornamentation, they must have borne a close resemblance.

The most important parts after these two columns were the altar of brass, 20 cubits long by 20 wide, and 10 in height, and the sea of brass. This altar, concerning which we have no precise information, and whose dimensions equalled the third of the temple, properly so called, was to be placed at the entrance of the vestibule in the hemicycle of the court of the priests.

Hiram afterwards founded the sea of brass, an enormous laver of bronze, of circular form, 10 cubits in diameter, and 5 cubits in depth. It was intended for the absolution of priests, who entered the temple to offer sacrifices. A cordon of 30 cubits girded its circumference. This immense basin, one palm in thickness, the edge of which turned over, like the leaf of an open lily, contained three thousand measures. The laver was ornamented on the exterior with two rows of sculpture representing bulls. The sea itself rested upon twelve bulls of bronze, grouped three by three; each group was turned towards one of the four cardinal points. The back group of bulls was hidden behind the laver, the bottom of which rested besides upon a base or pillar, circling into ten folds. Is not Assyrian influence to be found in this frequent use of the bull? We would, however, wish to note that the bulls of the temple of Jerusalem are not winged like the bulls of Khorsabad or of Nimrod.

Besides the sea of brass, from which the priests drew the water for the ablutions, Hiram founded ten other lavers, supported by brackets of bronze, on four wheels; these lavers, which were four cubits high, and in which everything was washed which was to be offered as a holocaust, were placed, five on the right and five on the left of the temple, in the court of the priests; they were decorated with crowns, wreaths, and figures, in bas-relief, representing lions, bulls, and cherubim. This decoration recalls to us one of the frieze compositions in the enameled brick of Khorsabad; the lion, the bull, and the winged figure analogous to the cherubim, are placed in the same order; only the frieze of Khorsabad contains a bird,\* a tree, and a plow beside.

It would require too much time to enumerate all the vases, vessels, and tables cast by Hiram for the temple. The objects of gold were not less numerous. The famous seven-branched chandelier, the ten thousand torches of the temple, the vessels, the censers, the ewers, were of gold. The vases and the bowls of gold numbered twenty thousand, and the vases and the bowls of silver were twice as numerous. There were forty thousand golden dishes to receive the finest flour which was diluted on the altar; a hundred and sixty thousand silver plates, sixty thousand golden cups, etc. These numbers somewhat recall the Thousand and One Nights. There was an altar of gold for the perfumes, and a table for the shew-bread. The hinges of the gates were of

\* Josephus introduces an eagle in this decoration. The eagle takes the place of the cherub.



gold. It is also true that the weight of gold which was brought every year to Solomon, either from Ophir or Tarsus, which places his fleet visited every three years, amounted to 666 talents of gold; all the vases of his table, and all the service of his palace of the forest of Lebanon, were also of very fine gold, and silver was looked upon as of no value.

The temple, which was commenced in the month of Zio, in the fourth year of the reign of King Solomon, was completed in the eleventh of the month of Bul. Solomon took seven years to build it.

The palace of Solomon, which was thirteen years in construction, and which was called the house of the forest of Lebanon, rested upon a foundation composed of enormous stones 8 or 10 cubits long. The edifice which bore this stylobate represented a sort of basilica, spacious enough to accommodate the crowd on the days when the king seated himself on the throne for the distribution of justice. This edifice was 100 cubits long, 50 wide, and 30 in height. The ceiling, of cedar-wood, was supported by three rows of fifteen pillars also of cedar-wood, and cut from Mount Lebanon. This arrangement bears a certain analogy to the edifices of Persepolis; only the pillars were of wood, and have not remained standing, like those of the hall of Xerxes, or of the palace of Darius. Josephus speaks of sixteen large pillars of Corinthian order, which supported the palace; but we prefer to give the preference to the Bible than to this historian. This magnificent palace was burned by Nabuzardan, general of the Chaldeans, under King Sedecias. It was during this same terrible invasion, that the Babylonians upset the temple, destroyed the two famous pillars of Jachin and Boaz, the sea of brass, the ten lavers, and carried away all the brass of the temple to Babylon, together with the vases, chandeliers, and ornaments of gold.

Josephus informs us that the interior of the palace of the forest of Mount Lebanon was decorated with works of sculpture representing trees and all kinds of plants, the branches and leaves of which were modelled and carved with so much delicacy and skill, that they seemed to be alive and in motion. These bas-reliefs formed a sort of frieze placed above the tapestry hangings which decorated the plinth. The remainder of the wall up to the ceiling was covered with stucco, and decorated with various kinds of paintings.

This decoration is, as may be seen, about of the same kind as that of the chambers of those palaces that are being disinterred in Mesopotamia. There are to be found those sculptured gypsum flag-stones which decorate the walls, the top of which is covered with a thin coat of painted stucco; the subjects alone being different. The Assyrians, whose law did not interdict the representation of men and animals, have substituted battles in the place of the hunting scenes, processions, shrubbery, and flowers of the Hebrews.

The throne of Solomon, so often imitated in the East, the ornamentation of which has, in some measure, remained symbolical, was of ivory covered with gold. The top was rounded behind, two hands held the seat on either side, and two lions were crouched under the two hands; the whole was of gold.

The seat was placed upon a platform of gold, which was reached by six steps equally of gold. Twelve young lions of gold were placed upon the steps, six on one side and six on the other. Josephus informs us that on the back of the seat was sculptured the figure of a bull, upon which Solomon leaned when he wished to look behind him. It is difficult to imagine how this Assyrian ornament could be adjusted.

In introducing sculptured animals in the ornamentation of the sea of brass and of his throne, Solomon had contravened the commandments of God, who forbid these representations. With this fault he was reproached, and the historian Josephus sees, in this caprice of an ostentatious prince, who was fond of the arts, a preliminary step towards that idolatry to which he afterwards gave himself up, in order to humor the seven hundred strange women whom he had married contrary to the laws of Moses.

Six hundred shields of gold, and two hundred lances of massive gold, were placed in the palace of the forest of Mount Lebanon, and no doubt hung upon the pillars of cedar, to add to the interior decoration of the principal chamber.

As we have seen, these edifices were of only short duration. Their magnificence, and the immense wealth which they contained, served to tempt the cupidity of jealous and powerful neighbors. At one time Ahag, besieged in Jerusalem by Rasin, king of Syria, and Phace, king of Israel, could only escape them by invoking the aid of Tiglath-pileser, king of the Assyrians, to whom he sent all the gold which he could gather up in the house of the Lord. This prince having, at his instigation, pillaged Damascus, capital of Syria, Ahag went to him, and in order to please his powerful ally, substituted the altar of brass which was before the Lord, by an altar similar to that of Damascus, sacrificed to the idol, to whom he raised altars in all the cities of Judea, partly dismantled the temple, which he closed, and which he no longer visited but in secret.

Hezekiah, who succeeded him, purified the temple and destroyed the idols. Sennacherib, king of Assyria, irritated by this revolt of a tributary, came at the head of a formidable army, attacked all the strong cities of Judea, which he took, notwithstanding the submission of Hezekiah, who sent him all the silver which remained in the house of the Lord, the king's treasure, and even the plates of gold which covered the gates of the temple: he threatened Jerusalem with total destruction. We know the prophecy of Isaiah, and the extermination of the army of Sennacherib by the angel of the Lord, who, in one night, killed a hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians.

Jerusalem was saved; but an indiscretion on the part of Hezekiah, caused, perhaps, later, the ruin of his country.

Baladan, king of Babylon, having sent his son, Berodach, to him with presents, Hezekiah hastened to show him the house containing perfumes, gold, and silver, and the house of his precious vases, as well as all his treasures. It was then that Isaiah, making him sensible of his mistake, said to him: "Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy

fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon; nothing shall be left, saith the Lord."

This prophecy of Isaiah was only to be fulfilled a hundred years after. However, under the long reign of Manasseh, it was followed by several invasions of the Babylonians, under Assarhaddon, in 672 (B.C.), and under Nebuchadnezzar I., in 658. Finally, in 507 Nebuchadnezzar II. took possession of Jerusalem, destroyed the temple four hundred and six years after its consecration, and carried all its wealth to Babylon.

We know that Cyrus permitted the Jews to return to their country, and to rebuild the city and temple of Jerusalem, because he had read the prophecy in which Isaiah, two hundred and ten years before he was born, had announced his coming in such magnificent language:

"Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden; I will go before thee, and will make the crooked places straight; I will break in pieces the gates of brass \* \* \* I will loose the loins of kings to open before him the two-leaved gates. He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid."

Josephus has preserved the edict that Cyrus issued on this occasion:

"King Cyrus to Sisina and to Sarabaza, greeting: We have allowed all those Jews who inhabit our states, and who wish to return to their country, to go there in full liberty, to rebuild the city of Jerusalem, and to reestablish the temple of God in the same order that it was at first. We send Zorobabel, their prince, and Mithridates our great treasurer, to lay its foundations, and raise them to the height of sixty cubits, and of equal width, with three rows of polished stone, and one row of wood growing in that province. We also wish that an altar should be built there to sacrifice to God; and we understand that the whole expense shall be defrayed by us. We likewise send back by Mithridates and by Zorobabel, the sacred vessels that King Nebuchadnezzar, had caused to be taken into the temple in order to have them placed there again. They consist of fifty basins of gold, and four hundred of silver; fifty vessels of gold, and four hundred of silver, fifty pails of gold, and five hundred of silver; thirty large dishes of gold, and three hundred of silver; thirty large bowls of gold, and two thousand four hundred of silver, and besides this, a thousand other large vessels.

"The sacrificers must offer to God all the victims in Jerusalem, according to the law of Moses, and shall pray for our prosperity, for that of our descendants, and for the Empire of Persia. That if any should be so bold as not to obey our commandments, we wish them to be crucified, and their goods confiscated for our benefit."

The curious inventory of the vases of the temple which this edict contains, singularly diminishes the Solomonic numbers. The reconstruction met with many obstacles, especially on the part of the Christians who were formerly transported to Samaria. Commenced under the reign of Cyrus, it was suspended when, three years later, he perished in the war against

the Massagetes. Cambyzes succeeded him, and we know how Darius son of Hydaspes took his place. Zorababel friend of the prince, having solved to his satisfaction a question which he had proposed, namely, Which was the most powerful, wine, kings, or women, obtained from him authority to undertake and finish the reconstruction of the temple.

This new edifice, built by Zorababel, on the site of the old one, does not appear to have the importance of the temple of Solomon. The edict of Cyrus, which had been deposited at Ecbatane, where Darius discovered it, only authorized the construction of an edifice 60 cubits high and 60 cubits wide. This edifice, as we have seen, was to have had only three stories of unpolished stone, and a row of wood entirely new. We do not find there again the same magnificence as in the ancient temple. Herod the Great, wished to restore it to its primitive splendor; he made of it an edifice entirely Roman and decorated the exterior court with Corinthian columns. The ornamentation alone preserved something of the Jewish style; in this manner, he enriched the capitals of the columns of the porch with branches of golden vine, with their clusters so exquisitely wrought, says Josephus, that, in these precious works the art was not second to the material. The court, constructed upon the platform of the ancient temple, was solidly fortified. It was here that the last defenders of Jerusalem took refuge when Titus besieged that city. Irritated by this resistance, Titus, conqueror, caused the temple to be demolished, of which, according to the prediction of God, there remains not one stone resting on another.

#### THE SOUND OF THE SEA.

A LITTLE child sits silent at her play,  
With wondering eyes, and listening mouth and ear,  
And forehead fair as e'er was formed of clay,  
O'er which the careless sunny ringlets play,—  
What does she hear?

Gazing on nothing—as a poet might,  
If thoughts of fearful beauty filled his mind—  
Her face turned up in such a trustful light;  
Surely, those azure eyes, so soft and bright,  
Cannot be blind!

Ah! now I see,—her rosy fingers hold  
A shell brought from some island of the blest,  
Round whose cool shore the sapphire waves are  
roll'd—  
A pearly shore—with crimson, green, and gold  
Upon its breast.

Look, for a moment! in its spiral cave,  
What wealth of pure and tender beauty lies,  
As if some orb concealed rose on the wave,  
And all its bosom tremulous should lave  
With matchless dyes!

And now she holds it to her ear again,  
And listens—as a lover for the song  
Of his beloved—to those strange sounds that wane  
And swell,—weird, wand'ring murmurs of the main,  
Its vaults along.

Dear, simple child! now let me be like thee,—  
And for a shell the world will suit my soul;  
Its wondrous beauty let me feel and see,  
And on the ear th' eternal melody  
From heaven shall roll.

FIDELIA.

#### THE HEIDELBERG BROTHERHOOD.

BY GUSTAV LESTON.

No. IV.

#### HOME THOUGHTS ABROAD.

I HAD been at lecture one afternoon, and coming down into the lower hall of the university building, I saw upon a black-board, which served for bulletins, a copy of the diploma recently awarded to Robert Leverett, in testimony of a degree in Civil Law, conferred upon him after an examination, passed *summā cum laude*, as the document phrased it.\* I was not a little rejoiced that our comrade had been rewarded with the highest honors, and as much surprised that he had presented himself for examination at all. He had never intimated among the Brotherhood that such was his intention; and the short time that he had been at the University, coming, as he did, without knowing even the rudiments of the language, would almost, I should have thought, have precluded the possibility of an adequate preparation. However, as I thought it over, it occurred to me, that although sufficiently versed in the German to profit by whatever lectures he might hear, he may have gone through his examination in some other tongue, say Latin or French, for the medium of communication in this department was, I knew, held of little consequence, provided the applicant possessed the required legal proficiency.

Accordingly I determined to go to his room at once and congratulate him, and passed out of doors through a sort of vestibule, where the posting-board was covered with notifications of this, that and the other thing, deemed by the advertisers, quite desirable for the well-being of all students; where they could eat and where they could lodge, and where clothe themselves, together with orders of the Facul-

\* For the curious in such matters, we transcribe the form of the diploma awarded, premising that the Grand Duke of Baden is the nominal Rector of the University, *ex-officio*, which authority was vested at the time, because of the imbecility of the sovereign, in his younger brother, Frederick, who ruled as Prince Regent. The acting chief of the University, with the title of Pro-Rector, is one of the Professors, who hold the office in rotation.

"Quod bonum, felix, faustumque sit sub auspiciis augustissimi et potentissimi principis ac domini domini FREDERICI, magnum ducatum Badarum regentis, ducis Zaringia, Rectoris Academicæ magnificentissimi, Pro-rectore Academicæ, magnifico viro amplissimo, illustrissimo ROBERTO MOHL, philosophiæ doctore, professore publico, ordinariis magno duci Badarum a consiliis aulæ intimis ordinis Leonis Zaring equite, Nos Decanus Senior ceterique Professores ordinis jurisconsultorum in literatum universitate Ruperto-Carola in virum doctissimum et darissimum ROBERTUM LEVERETT, Massachusettensem examine rigoroso *summā cum laude* superato *gradum* doctoris summos in utroque jure honores rite contulimus et hoc diplomate sigillo ordinis nostri inunito testati sumus."

There are four grades of these, the lowest being those in which the examination has been passed *cum laude* (with praise); the next, *magna cum laude* (with great praise); then *insigni cum laude* (with remarkable praise); and the last *summā cum laude* (with the highest praise.)

ties, and specifications of lectures. The clock of the building had just been striking the hour, and—tramp, tramp—the audiences of the various professors were emerging from their lecture-rooms. The greater proportion of them had passed me, as I stood before the diploma, and when I reached the square, on which the building is situated, they had mostly dispersed in various directions, although a few clung round the corners of the several streets leading from it. By this time, too, around the same corners, came a new set to attend the lectures of the following hour. Five minutes intervened between the ringing of the bell, and the commencement of the next lecture. During this time the students collect gradually in their various lecture-rooms. One of the professors was walking up and down in the shade, on the opposite side, with some books under his arm, occasionally casting his eye at the clock on the belfry, for it is a matter of habit with them, never to enter their desks but on the minute, so as to commence at once. Two others had met by the fountain, and were holding a converse to while away the remaining minute.

I saw the artist coming down the Hauptstrasse (the Main street), which bounds the square on one side, and waiting at the corner, he joined me, and we continued in his direction. Hal had just told him of Leverett's success, and he was bound upon a like errand with myself. It was a Saturday afternoon, and a great portion of the haberdashers being Jews, their shops along the main street were distinguishable by their closed shutters, and parties of them, of both sexes, among whom the artists tipped his hat to some well-known beauties, were sauntering along in their holiday finery, all in the direction of the chiefly-frequented ascending path of the castle grounds, where they congregate in great numbers on their sabbath afternoons, promenade among its paths, and contribute very sparingly to the plates, kept at the path-corners, whose collections go to remunerate the band, which plays from the stand near the restaurant. Students with their jaunty caps, whose small round crowns pitched over upon their broad, flat visors, some legged with wrinkled overboots, switching their canes, carrying their black portfolios (which contain their hefts, MS. brochures of notes made at the lectures) under their arms, many of them followed by their big dogs, whose pink tongues quivered at the corners of their mouths—mixed in with the other multitudes of the street, burghers, peasants, and beggars—were all to be passed through, some to be recognized, before we reached the old brown stone church, where Protestants and Catholics both worship, divided by a traverse partition, the latter possessing the spire-end. This big dingy edifice, standing open to all sides, the widening of the main street at one end of it, forming quite a square—the busy spot, of market days,—looked with its manifold buttresses on both sides, like a many-legged monster, nicely ensconced under the roof for its shell, its tall spire some extended feeler, who appeared very much as though some fine day, it would take it into its head to trot down street, and knock over the Heilbron gate for a trip into the country—so Hal used to say. A side street, in which